



June 27, 2006

Robert S. Kentner
P.O. Box 203
Lafayette, IN 47902
Telephone (765) 271-8260

ATTN: Gordon Baldwin
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sent by certified mail and
fax transmission to fax no. (571)273-8300

RE: Patent Application; Application No. 10/645,766; Filing Date 8/22/03; Confirmation No. 8051; Patent application made by Wanthisa Kentner, Robert Kentner and Narong Chandrruangphen.

Dear Mr. Gordon:

I am writing to you in reference to the above noted matter. Moreover please consider my correspondence as a response to your Office's letter dated April 5, 2006.

Please also change your records to reflect my new mailing address and phone number.
Please send all future correspondence to my new mailing address.

Your Office's correspondence dated April 5, 2006 reflects that the Patent Office is denying our claim. In response to your denial, I would like to point out why the denial is inappropriate and why your Office's evaluation is inaccurate. Furthermore, I would like to share with the Patent Office why a patent application should be granted in this particular case.

The patent application submitted(by myself and others) is distinguishable from both the Young patent (Pat. No. 4,708,892) and the Bouillot patent (Pat. No. 3,822,171) in the same respect. Unlike the patent application submitted, neither the Young or Bouillot patents involve three-dimensional flowers being produced. Rather the Young and

Bouillot patents concern themselves with two-dimensional flowers and the creation thereof. No mention is made in the Young or Bouillot patents of three-dimensional flowers being created. Additionally, the current patent application, unlike the Young and Bouillot patents and which only reference two-dimensions, besides being three dimensional, contain spaces and cavities within each flower due to the three-dimensional nature of the flowers. The creation of a three-dimensional versus a two-dimensional flower is a completely different design resulting in a completely different visual effect and thus product.

These differences are sufficient to make the current patent application distinguishable from both the Young and Bouillot patents and thus a patent should be awarded in the above case. As patent applicants, we would like the Patent Office to reconsider the patent application submitted and request that the Patent Office grant the patent applied for.

Please call me at (765) 271-8260 to discuss this matter further or write me at P.O. Box 203, Lafayette IN 47902.

Truly yours,



Robert S. Kentner